OCTOBER 1962

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 14

6

ANOTHER CUBAN CRISIS

THE EDITORS

THE WORLD OF SCIENCE

PHILIP MORRISON

WORK AND PROPERTY

R. H. TAWNEY

The Student Movement FRANK KOFSKY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME FOURTEEN NUMBER SIX OCTOBER 1962

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Another Cuban Crisis ... 289
HUNGER AND DEMOCRACY: A LETTER FROM A MEXICAN ... 299
THE WORLD OF SCIENCE by Philip Morrison ... 301
WHAT IS FULL EMPLOYMENT? by Philip Eden ... 309
WORK AND PROPERTY by R. H. Tawney ... 319
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing ... 323
BOOKS: THE STUDENT MOVEMENT by Frank Kofsky ... 329

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1962, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One Year—$5; two years—$9.
By 1st class mail—United States $7; everywhere else $8.
By air mail—No. America $9; So. America $14; Europe $18; Asia and Africa $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

MR Press has an unprecedentedly heavy publishing schedule for the months ahead. Titles already in the works are: *Philosophy of Man,* by Adam Schaff, the well known Polish philosopher; *The Menace of the Miracle: Germany from Hitler to Adenauer,* by Heinz Abosch, German journalist; *Life and Ideas of Robert Owen,* by A. L. Morton, British Marxist historian; *The Struggle for Law in South Africa,* by Julius Lewin, South African legal scholar and teacher; and two short books on Cuba: *The October Revolution in Cuba,* by J. P. Morray; and *The United States, Cuba, and Castro,* by William A. Williams, University of Wisconsin historian. We will announce details in future issues with enough advance notice so readers can take advantage of low prepublication prices.

Meanwhile, the following publication dates and prepublication prices have already been announced: *The Pen and the Sword,* by Michael Foot, November 5 (prepublication price, $4.50); *View from the West,* by Claud Cockburn, November 14 (prepublication price, $2.25—in combination with the same author's *Crossing the Line,* $4.50); *Education and the Working Class,* by Brian Jackson and Dennis Marsden, November 21 (prepublication price, $4.50). All of these prices represent large deductions from list prices, so order now and save.

(continued on inside back cover)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANOTHER CUBAN CRISIS

Perhaps the most important—and appalling—thing about the new Cuban crisis which has boiled up in Washington following the announcement of expanded Soviet aid to the Castro regime, is the light it throws on the U.S. mentality.

There have been shrill demands, from influential Republicans and Democrats alike, for a full-scale invasion of Cuba or, what might prove to be just as serious, a naval blockade. But this outcry is really less revealing than the reasons advanced for *not* invading or blockading Cuba by those who are opposed. They are *not* against it because it would obviously be illegal—violative of U.S. domestic legislation, of traditional international law, of the UN Charter, and of numerous specific treaty provisions establishing and defining the scope of the Organization of American States. They are *not* against it because aggression of one country against another is wrong or immoral. They all assume, without hesitation, that there is a higher law and a higher morality which stem from what they choose to consider the "national interest." And once the national interest has been invoked, literally anything goes. The *New York Times,* mouthpiece of responsible and moderate ruling-class opinion, put the matter in a nutshell when, in discussing the Monroe Doctrine, it wrote (September 6): "It is not dead, as Premier Khrushchev says, because it is a unilateral document which means what we say it means; but it would require a presently unacceptable military implementation to be effective in Cuba now."

This is saying that the U.S. has a right to attack Cuba or, by implication, any other Latin American country, any time it wants to.* The only reason it shouldn't do so "now" is that

* The rest of the world is similarly covered by the Truman and Eisenhower Doctrines: they just don't happen to have been in question this past week.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bad effects would outweigh the good. The trouble with the Capeharts and the Thurmonds, in this view, is not that they are vicious instigators of dreadful criminal acts but simply that they haven't thought through the consequences of their proposals.

This is clear enough and perhaps all to the good. The reaction of the U.S. ruling class to recent Cuban developments should be sufficient to put a stop once and for all to the nauseating hypocrisy which has so long been the special characteristic of American attitudes toward the rest of the world. Let us hear no more of the U.S. as the embodiment of international legality, the defender of freedom, the champion of virtue and morality. All that is hogwash for the ignorant and gullible, to be forgotten as soon as the sacred national interest appears to be threatened.

Not that there is any likelihood of a change in the style and rhetoric of U.S. spokesmen and representatives. The habits are too deeply ingrained. But at any rate after this display of the true attitudes and standards of the U.S. ruling class, it is reasonable to expect a diminution of the numbers of the ignorant and gullible. People all over the world, inside as well as outside the U.S., are waking up to the real posture of the U.S. in international affairs. This latest Cuban crisis should do much to accelerate the process.

Meanwhile, it is crucially important that the people and rulers of the U.S. should really be clear about the implications of various proposed Cuban policies. And the first thing to be stressed and stressed again is that the use of force would not only have dire consequences for both Cubans and Americans, but would sow the dragon's teeth of disaster for the future.

The casualties of an invasion could well run into scores of thousands, not by any means all on the Cuban side. And that would be just the beginning. *No stable counter-revolutionary government would ever be possible in Cuba again.* A real revolution such as has taken place there is irreversible; the only alternatives are advance to a new society or forced collapse into chaos. Attempts to restore the status quo ante could only lead to a regime of bloody terror on the one side and prolonged and embittered resistance on the other. Algeria, 1954-1962, can

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serve as the latest reminder of the frightful human costs of such exercises in stopping or turning back the clock of history. By contrast, the human costs of the Cuban Revolution to date have been light indeed.

But the consequences of an invasion of Cuba would by no means be limited to the island or to relations between Cuba and the U.S. Cuba has asked for and received generous aid from the Soviet Union. In this, both sides are strictly within their rights, as the U.S., with not one but many military allies and satellites on the borders of the Soviet Union, must be the first to admit. There are, to be sure, differences between Soviet policy toward Cuba and U.S. policy toward such countries as Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. Unlike the U.S., the Soviet Union has signed no treaties guaranteeing military assistance in case of attack on Cuba and has never asked for Cuban bases (it should not be forgotten that there is only one foreign base in Cuba and it doesn't belong to the Soviet Union). But these differences, real and important though they are, do not mean that the Soviet Union could sit idly by in case of U.S. aggression against Cuba. In granting aid, the Soviet Union assumed a moral obligation to do everything in its power to protect Cuba from aggression, and its honor and prestige among the weak and hungry nations of the world evidently depend in a crucial way on how it discharges that responsibility. For our part, we have never believed, and do not now believe, that the Soviet Union would retaliate with atomic missiles against a U.S. attack on Cuba. That would be a way to destroy the world, not to protect Cuba. But we do believe that the Soviet Union both would and could take strong counter-measures which would leave the U.S. face to face with agonizing and dangerous choices. Suppose, for example, that following a U.S. attack on Cuba, the Soviet Union were to surround Berlin, at the same time announcing that the blockade would be lifted as soon as the U.S. ceased its aggression against Cuba. Would America's European allies be willing to risk certain destruction in order to uphold Washington's unilateral interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine? How would the rest of the world feel about it? Is it not clear that by attacking Cuba the United States would be running a grave risk of isolating itself from all the decent forces

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the world community and at the same time of having to choose between backing down or fleeing forward into World War III? We do not mean to suggest that a renewed Berlin blockade is necessarily the form that Soviet retaliation would take: given the U.S.'s world-wide commitments and far-flung bases, there are obviously many other forms it might take. The point is only that the alternatives open to the Soviet Union would by no means be confined to inaction or rockets. And whatever one it might choose, the difficulties of the United States could only be multiplied and compounded.

Nor is even this all. It cannot be said too often or too emphatically that the Cuban Revolution is but a phase, an aspect of the great Latin American Revolution of the 20th century which began in Mexico in 1910 and is now spreading to the whole vast continent of South America. U.S. military intervention in Cuba would double and redouble the speed of this process and at the same time insure that it would take on the ugliest and most violent forms. Every Latin American country without exception would immediately become a theater of open or veiled civil war between the supporters of Cuba and the supporters of the U.S.; volunteers from all over the continent would join in the struggle, either in Cuba itself or wherever the representatives or symbols of the North American colossus might show themselves. And if the United States, in its ignorance and arrogance, should attempt to intervene everywhere to restore law and order and preserve the status quo, it would simply be transplanting the Cuban horror, magnified a thousand times, to an area much larger than its own. No surer way to hasten the decline and fall of the American empire could well be imagined.

No, gentlemen of the American ruling class, make no mistake, there is no way out of your difficulties through the use of force against Cuba. Cuba is too strong, has too many powerful friends, and stands for too much in the eyes of the peoples of Latin America for that approach to have the slightest chance of success.

Fortunately, the Kennedy administration seems to have reached that conclusion too, at least for the present. That was the clear implication of the President's remark at his press

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conference early in September that he thought invading Cuba would be a mistake. We can believe him, not because the record of his administration for telling the truth is particularly good, especially with respect to Cuba, but simply because it is a fact which the President of the United States could hardly help recognizing that to invade Cuba *would* be a mistake, a very grave mistake, *from the point of view of the ruling-class interests of which he is the special spokesman and guardian.*

But if invasion is unlikely at this time, what other means can the U.S. adopt to prevent the spread of the ideas and practices of the Cuban Revolution? For we must recognize that to prevent this spread *is* very much in the interest of the U.S. ruling class. The answer of Kennedy and his advisers to this question is implicit in their past policies and actions (as well as in those of the Eisenhower administration before them). It is essentially a two-sided answer: on the one hand the U.S. must do everything possible to sabotage the success of the Cuban Revolution (economic embargoes and boycotts, political warfare, support for underground opposition, etc.); on the other hand, the U.S. must somehow bring about needed reforms in the rest of Latin America as a means of effectively immunizing it against the virus of *fidelismo*. If the hope of betterment via the Cuban revolutionary path could be shown to be a mirage and the revolutionary impulse throughout the rest of Latin America could be blunted, then the day might yet be saved. And these have in fact been the guiding principles of the U.S. policy.

Despite much eloquent oratory and a few vague claims, the Alliance for Progress, which was supposed to herald the dawn of a new day in Latin America, has accomplished absolutely nothing. On the contrary, economic conditions have deteriorated in most Latin American countries during the last couple of years, and the democratic figleaf covering the nakedness of oligarchical rule is being torn away by what Herbert Matthews calls a "threatened tidal wave of militarism." ("When Generals Take Over in Latin America," *New York Times Magazine*, September 9, 1962, p. 142.)

On the other hand, the U.S. policy of sabotaging the Cuban Revolution has achieved substantial results: the drastic change in markets and sources of supply, the mass defection

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of skilled technical and administrative personnel, the shortage of spare parts for American-made equipment—these and other difficulties imposed from without have combined with various internal weaknesses and calamities to produce a severe economic crisis. The U.S. ruling class was congratulating itself and even beginning to look forward to the total collapse of the revolutionary regime. It was in these circumstances that the Cubans asked for and secured expanded Soviet aid; and it is now clear to every one that the Revolution is not going to collapse after all. Meanwhile, despite all the difficulties, the vast majority of the Cuban people are still better off than their counterparts in the rest of Latin America.* The attractive power of the Cuban Revolution may have been temporarily dimmed, but it still exists and it will grow as economic problems are solved and new cadres are trained. Realization of this fact by the U.S. ruling class, indeed, is the basic cause of the latest Cuban crisis. The unforgivable crime of the USSR is not that it is endangering U.S. security by shipping to Cuba a relative handful of weapons but that it is insuring the survival and progress of the Cuban Revolution. Thus the one policy toward Latin America which did seem to be working—the tarnishing of the image of the Cuban Revolution—has now been effectively countered; and it is the recognition of this in Washington that accounts for the renewed outpouring of hatred and venom against Cuba during the past two weeks.

With its whole Latin American policy thus threatened with ignominious failure, the U.S. ruling class must do some hard thinking about where it goes from here. The irresponsibles have of course responded by demanding an immediate invasion. But with the disastrous consequences of such action staring them in the face, the President and his advisers must come up with something else. What will it be?

First and most immediately, they must contain the resurgent war party. This Kennedy has sought to do in a most characteristic way, by asking for authority to call up 150,000 men in the Ready Reserves. It is a tactic already used by

* For an indication of the standard of living of the great majority of Mexicans, see the letter published on page 299 of this issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eisenhower in 1955 when he was being pressured to go to war against China over the offshore islands. Its essence is to make military gestures to take the wind out of the sails of the extreme militarists. And it has the incidental side advantage of enabling the government to step up its military spending, specially welcome at a time when the economy is entering a new recession.

But all this has nothing to do with the substantive issues with which the nation's Latin American policy must grapple.

There are two, and really only two, possible courses open to the U.S. One is to intensify the policies of the past in the hope that somehow failure can now be turned into success. The other is to face up to the world of 1962, to recognize the real meaning of the Cuban Revolution, and to come to terms with it.

The first course would continue to have two facets, the harassment of Cuba and the patching up of Latin America. And neither is likely to be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past. All wishful thinking to the contrary notwithstanding, the revolutionary regime in Cuba has now, as it has had from the beginning, the passionate support of the great majority of the Cuban people. Most of the die-hard opponents have by now emigrated. The armed forces and security apparatus are strong and growing stronger. Expanded Soviet aid insures that the economic situation will improve, however slowly and haltingly. In these conditions, outside attempts at sabotage and political warfare can (and will) make difficulties and cause much suffering; there is no prospect whatever that they will be decisive.

But what about the possibility of reforming the rest of Latin America in time to immunize it against the revolutionary virus? Now that the seriousness of the need can be appreciated by every schoolboy, may it not be possible to infuse real life and dynamism into the Alliance for Progress? This is, of course, the great hope of the liberals; and if it had any chance of succeeding, it would certainly be, *from the point of view of U.S. capitalism,* the most rational, intelligent, and humane policy to follow. But it hasn't any chance of succeeding.

The reason is that the traditional Latin American ruling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes, whose cooperation is the sine qua non of successful reform, have already given up. Theirs is the classic pre-revolutionary attitude of doomed ruling classes: *après moi le déluge.* Far from wanting, still less intending, to reform their homelands, they are simply attempting to salvage what they can from the wreckage. Consider the following testimony of a well-informed U.S. businessman. Peter Nehemkis, a representative of the Whirlpool Corporation, giant appliance manufacturer with extensive business relations in Latin America, is talking, remarkably candidly, to a Congressional committee charged with responsibility for following Latin American economic affairs:

> The absence of confidence by Latin America's business elite and ruling groups is vividly demonstrated by their own export of capital which, over the past decade, has been in excess of $10 billion. In passing, may I say that this $10 billion represents the amount of flight capital in numbered bank accounts in Switzerland alone. My New York banker friends tells me that the amount of flight capital on deposit in New York, or invested in American securities or bonds, is probably equal to another $10 or $12 billion.*

The Alliance for Progress, on the most optimistic calculations, is supposed to inject into the Latin American economies $20 billion in the next ten years. It seems clear that the Latin American oligarchies are getting it out faster than that. In other words, the Alliance for Progress, to the extent that it works at all, is turning out to be a device for siphoning funds out of the pockets of U.S. taxpayers and investors and into the foreign bank accounts of the Latin oligarchs. Meanwhile, conditions will continue to deteriorate; right-wing-military coups and dictatorships will proliferate; and the area will sink more or less rapidly into a state of bloody anarchy out of which only the Revolution —radical, determined, and as ruthless as the conditions demand —can bring order and rebirth.

That is the way things are going in Latin America right now—the recent military coups in Argentina and Peru as well as the impotence of constitutional government in the face of

---

* *Economic Development in South America,* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relations of the Joint Economic Committee, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess., May 10 and 11, 1962, p. 50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crisis conditions in Brazil are merely the latest proofs. And there is absolutely nothing the United States can do to halt, let alone reverse, the trend. How much more rational, then, for the U.S. to face up to reality, to accept the inevitability of the Latin American Revolution, and to seek to work out, patiently and magnanimously, a new hemispheric order of mutual tolerance and peaceful coexistence. And when we say rational, we mean rational from the point of view of the real interests of the U.S. ruling class itself. It can never be emphasized too strongly that the power of the Right in Latin America derives from U.S. economic and military support. It is a wholly negative and destructive power which must and will be swept away. But how long-drawn-out, how costly, how painful, how bloody that process will be will depend almost wholly on the United States, not on the Latin Americans themselves. If U.S. support for the Latin American status quo is withdrawn in time, the Revolution will triumph quickly and in some countries—Chile and even Brazil come to mind as outstanding candidates—perhaps peacefully and democratically.

If that should happen, a new era in United States-Latin American relations would become a real possibility. Again, it cannot be too strongly emphasized—we use the phrase repeatedly because the situation demands it—that Latin America desperately needs all the genuine help it can get, and most of all from the U.S. which has been its traditional market and supplier over the years. If the Latin American countries could be assured that the United States would *really* respect their sovereignty and deal with them as equals, they would, even under radical revolutionary regimes, go a long way to satisfy the demands and meet the claims of U.S. private and governmental interests. Trade could be vastly expanded, to the great benefit of many U.S. industries; and if reasonable compensation for expropriated U.S. properties were part of the price demanded by the U.S., the Latin American countries would almost certainly be prepared to pay it. At bottom, the issues between the United States and Latin America are not the price of exports or imports nor yet the terms of compensation for expropriated property, but the sovereign right of the Latin American countries to plan their own economies and societies for the benefit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the vast majority of the people who live in them rather than for the benefit of a tiny minority as in the past. Let that right once be conceded, freely and honestly, and all else will follow.

But it *must* be conceded if disasters the magnitude and horror of which are literally beyond the possibility of anyone to imagine, are to be avoided. And the way for the U.S. to concede it is very simply to accept the fait accompli of the Cuban Revolution and to begin to work out the terms of peaceful coexistence with it.

We are not fools or idiots enough to expect so drastic a change in U.S. policy overnight or in the near future. But neither can we despair of its possibility. Such a change is not only in the interest of the overwhelming majority of Americans, both North and South, but also of the U.S. ruling class itself. No one marches forward to certain disaster, not even the most stubborn, once he knows the course he is on. And it is up to us who understand to redouble our efforts to convince our fellow-countrymen, all of them without exception, that in our country's relations with our neighbors to the South, we are now indeed on a disaster course.

(September 12, 1962)

Irish history shows how disastrous it is for a nation when it has subjugated another nation. All the abominations of the English have their origin in the Irish Pale.

—Karl Marx

If we allotted say one-tenth of the amount put into national defense each year—about five billion dollars annually—for a stateside Alliance for Progress aimed at eliminating poverty and exploitation, we ought to show great results in a half generation or less. This poses a pretty question: which comports more with a noble vision of the end, a society systematically uprooting and eliminating destitution and discrimination, or a society building thousands of silos to house thousands of multi-megaton missiles?

—W. H. Ferry

Whatever may be the fate of the great Chinese revolution against which various "civilized" hyenas are now sharpening their teeth, no forces in the world will restore the old serfdom in Asia, nor erase from the face of the earth the heroic democracy of the popular masses in the Asiatic and semi-Asiatic countries.

Lenin, 1911

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUNGER AND DEMOCRACY: A LETTER FROM A MEXICAN

The following is a literal translation of a letter addressed to the editors of MR. It is dated July 4, 1962, and postmarked from New Jersey. —The Editors

Since the newspapers and magazines talk of hunger, and especially of the hunger in the socialist countries, be it real or fictitious, but don't talk of the hunger in the capitalist countries of the "free world" which have "representative democracy as a form of government," I send you some figures from the country closest to us (Mexico):

Annual income per person in dollars	Percentage of population	
0 to 17.45	1.21	Population that suffers chronic hunger, 66.96 percent
17.46 to 34.90	6.72	
34.91 to 52.36	15.68	
52.37 to 69.81	12.32	
69.82 to 87.27	12.03	
87.28 to 130.00	19.00	
130.91 to 174.54	12.52	
174.55 to 349.09	14.22	
349.10 to 523.63	3.56	(Minimum wage
523.64 and over	2.74	$0.14½ per hour)

The cost of a daily diet of 2,000 calories is 33 cents at current retail prices in Mexico. It consists of:

One glass of milk (250 c.c.)
40 grams of meat
one egg, one piece of bread
50 grams of beans
50 grams of rice
100 grams of corn (*tortillas*)
50 grams of sugar, one piece of fruit
100 grams of vegetables

From this it is evident that at least two-thirds of the population of Mexico is hungry and suffers the consequences of hunger, including death, while 2 percent are owners of everything that 98 percent produce.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I hope that these figures are useful to you in some way. A man greets you who has suffered a great deal, but a very great deal of hunger, and who never has been in China nor in Cuba but always lived in Mexico, and finally was able to escape from that "democracy" and came to this one, which has other very big defects, but where at least one eats, although they also make us eat a lot of propaganda.

I don't give you my name and address because in these countries of "LIBERTY" one mistrusts everyone, and the only thing I can tell you is that I took the facts given above from the reactionary magazine *Impacto* of 6/6/62, number 640, and from the FAO.

Also, I beg you to forgive my writing to you in Spanish instead of the language of the country, but I wouldn't have been able to do it clearly in English.

A fearful, mistrusting—or whatever you want to call me—Mexican greets you affectionately. In my country they say: "The animal who gets burned by hot water flees from cold water too," and I have already been burned by hot water, and I'm not interested in finding out the temperature of this water. And I swear to you that I will never again believe what Constitutions say, least of all in the matter of freedom of expression.

So, I ask you to forgive me.

The foundation of a comfortable standard of life is a decent house. A family requires, above everything, a reliable health service and the best possible education, but growing wealth always leaves us with a greater deficiency in just those things. It is not an accident that it should be so. Capitalist industry is dazzlingly efficient at producing goods to be sold in the shops, and directly and indirectly, profits are derived from selling. The services to meet basic human needs do not lend themselves to mass production and, especially as with our egalitarian democratic notions, they have to be offered irrespective of means to pay, they are not an easy field for making profits. Consequently they must be largely provided through taxation. To supply goods is a source of profit but to supply services is a "burden upon industry." It is for this reason that when, as a nation, we in England "have never had it so good" we find that we "cannot afford" just what we most need.

—*Joan Robinson, Economics of 1962*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORLD OF SCIENCE

by Philip Morrison

"Plenty of Room at the Bottom"

Almost three years ago, Richard Feynman, perhaps the most original of contemporary theoretical physicists, so entitled, in his usual raffish vein, an after-dinner talk to the American Physical Society. He then made a curious and ingratiating personal offer: a thousand dollars to the maker of the first working electric motor brought to him which, without its lead-in wires, would occupy no more than a cube one sixty-fourth of an inch on edge. Stop to think for a moment how small this is. I have measured through a magnifier, and I find that the little spinning motor would fit quite nicely, with a practical margin all around, onto a single ordinary period like the one at the end of this sentence. The prize was claimed, and I have watched the motor spinning, under a modest microscope, in the Feynmans' Pasadena living room.

Certainly this was no work-a-day sort of task, but it was by no means set capriciously. It was Professor Feynman's dramatic way of calling attention to the enormous gap between the size of our most delicate artifacts, and the minimum dimensions set to any complexity by the inherent atomicity of matter —the "room at the bottom." Men build in a narrow range of size—dwarfed by the mountains perforce, but gross compared to the atoms—only by habit and the want of understanding. For between the dimensions of what we build and the atomic scale lies an incredible range of complex systems, the living organisms, to which class we belong. To be sure, we are large overall, but the living cells of which we are made are themselves tiny intricate organisms. It is probable that life itself is merely one property of intricacy-made-small; all its characteristics, response, growth, self-reproduction, can be seen to depend upon its marvelous dense complexity of structure.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There were many would-be claimants of Feynman's prize. For half a year they appeared with their products, in every case a hopelessly misconceived attempt to offer something just as good: a tiny gasoline engine an inch long, or a small ship in a bottle. These hobbyists thought the offer implied a mere interest in curiosa, not a serious goal of engineering. Nearly a year later a young man appeared with his claim to the prize. By this time Feynman was tired of the stream of Los Angeles eccentrics, and gave listless assent to examine the device. His visitor began to unwrap a box more than large enough to hold a pair of shoes, and the physicist's heart sank. Once more an obsessed Angeleno had found him. But beneath the wrappings this time was the familiar wooden case of a microscope; Feynman knew then that he was confronted by no crackpot, but a man of deftness and understanding. There was the wanted motor, visible under the magnifying lenses, driven by a small hand-cranked generator. The young engineer of a Los Angeles instrumentation firm, working in off-hours in the wonderfully equipped miniature instrument shop of his company, had fulfilled the conditions in a few months of work, and won the prize.

One significant tale of the nature of that painstaking work must be told. The builder was asked what was the most troubling difficulty he had met on the way. His answer was simple, but unexpected. The parts, he said, are easy enough to make, once you decide on a design which suits your skills. After all, it takes little time to slice from an iron wire a disc of iron thinner than a hair's breadth. It was not the fabrication itself which seemed taxing. It was losing the parts once made. The whole job could not be carried through at one sitting. Between times, the parts and the tiny tools had to rest on the microscope stage, awaiting the next work session. Even with care, it proved impossible to prevent the finished parts from sometimes wandering away under a little draft of air or the vibrations of a too-heavy footstep. But to find a mislaid part was hard. Any random speck of dust might turn out to be the missing part, or might remain only a speck of dust under the microscope. Most of a work period was often spent in searching for the right part among a collection of all but invisible grains. There was a solution, one deep with implication. Instead of making only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one iron disc, or one quartz shaft, the ingenious builder, once he had set up for the task, would turn out and put aside many more identical parts of a given sort than he would ever need. Now, when a part was lost, the search of grains of dust turned up, perhaps not the lost part itself, but its duplicate. In this way, the work went well.

Feynman's half-serious plan was to see such a tiny motor driving many machine tools on the appropriate scale, until a tiny machine shop might be made. Using that shop under the microscope, what marvels of miniature construction might not then be possible? He hoped by this scheme to evolve an engineering of the very small, one which might rival the wonderful microscopic intricacy of the living being. So far no second step has been taken, and it is more than probable that this naively straightforward way of using the metalworker's craft at successively smaller scale will never be carried out. Life is seated in molecular chains, coils, and nets, in endless motion; the clumsier mechanical arts of screw-thread and shaft, the descendants of clockwork, seem not to carry within them any such richness, even if they could be applied at the sub-microscopic level, as rivals to life's subtlety. But there are more modern technologies which do suggest themselves: the electronic circuits, whose moving parts are electrons, are nimble and flexible beyond any metal mechanism.

It is the electronic circuit, reduced in size so much as to appear magical, which holds promise for man-made intricacy which might one day come to rival the wonderful properties of that molecular fabric, life.

The banal convenience of the pocket transistor set, or the "wrist-watch radio," or even the encapsulated transmitter the surgeon can now feed his patient to probe intestinal chemistry by radio, cannot suggest the smallness of scale on which a few men are beginning to work. We need to present examples fitter to describe the "room at the bottom," the gap between what our eyes and fingers can probe and the limiting graininess of atomic matter.

Here on the Cornell campus we rejoice in the possession of a huge new library building, just occupied in the last year or so, when the book torrent had stuffed our seventy-year old

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

landmark library to an intolerable density. Now we have a book stack of seven or eight very large floors, each lined solid with high, compact steel shelves, far from filled by our couple of million volumes. Suppose one had decided to make a close inspection of some part of the world, photographing it really carefully at the highest practical magnification of the excellent electron microscopes of our time. Each photo could be reproduced, on the page of a book of standard size, on good thin paper; and every side of every page of a thick volume could be filled with the photos. Then imagine filling the new library solid with such volumes, and with them alone, every page different, displaying in our fancy, at the best visual magnification we can presently employ, the real microscopic look of the world. What area could be recorded in a great library in this way? It is not hard to show that those volumes, shelf upon shelf, corridor after corridor, eight floors high, would suffice to display the electron microscope's view of rather more than half of one side of an ordinary dollar bill. Nor is this the natural limit. The molecular structures which we know to be decisive for life are still invisible in detail at this magnification; the detail which the biologist would really regard as ultimate would require a few hundred times more storage space. That is the measure of the "room at the bottom."

Of course the image can be reversed. If we could use the power of the electron microscope to reduce size, as we can cause the stage to become dwarfed in the distance by looking through opera glasses the wrong way, plainly the contents of the Cornell library, text and pictures alike, could be stored on a surface the size of half a page of MONTHLY REVIEW. The virtuosi who inscribe the Lord's Prayer on the head of a pin are clumsy scrawlers measured by such a standard.

At Stanford Research Institute in California, a brave and original physicist, K. R. Shoulders, has undertaken to carry out the task of "looking the wrong way" through an electron microscope. He will do more than look, of course; he will in fact produce the smallest of artifacts, controlled forms on a scale visible only to the electron microscope itself. He published a photograph a year or two ago of his earliest success. It was nothing very interesting in itself, simply a lattice pattern printed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in metal, just the shape of a bit of fine wire mesh he had in the lab. But this pattern, sharply-defined and in high contrast, was not as large as a common bacterial cell. It is, I believe, the smallest man-made object. It could as easily have had the shape of a letter, or even a few letters, and it is in principle the basis for a typography so small that it could display, not merely the Lord's Prayer, but the entire Bible in English, Greek, Hebrew, and Latin on the head of a common pin, leaving wide margins.

Shoulders' goal—it probably lies at the end of the work of the next generation of physicists, which he can at most foreshadow—is no mere compact storage of symbols, but functioning devices built on such a scale. This is possible since he works with patterns in sound metal, molybdenum or tungsten, laid down on a strong insulating substratum, which might be optically-flat artificial sapphire. He can lay down patterns in conducting metal and in insulating silica as well. From such patterns deposited layer upon layer, he can build up electronic circuits, with the resistors and the rest "printed" on the foundation layer, much like the printed circuitry of commonplace size now in widespread commercial use. But more than that, he dreams of building radio tubes out of metal and insulation by careful shaping of his deposited patterns. They will need to be free of air, of course, but since he perforce works in a good vacuum, that need sets him no problem whatever. He can expect no glowing filament, but it turns out that on this tiny scale, enough electrons to do the work he wants can be produced by simple points of metal, even at room temperature, once he applies the needed outside source of voltage. Such a tube, made of a layered and controlled structure of deposited metal, empty evacuated space, and silica, might occupy a fraction of the volume of a bacterial cell. It is clear that such a cell is enormously more intricate in structure and function than this tiny radio tube; but it needs to be recalled that the circuits men build work at microsecond speeds, while biochemical reactions, subtle as they are, progress by milliseconds or even slower.

We can make a plausible speculation, still only a speculation, that the ingenious techniques of using the electron microscope as an etching tool of unprecedented fineness and speed will meet no essential obstacle. If they do not, we may look

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forward to the day when such etching electron beams, controlled by large digital computers to shape their patterns with the speed of the television tube, can produce such micro-structures to advanced designs. It is reasonable to expect that a hard, smooth, plate of sapphire, with a few dozen wires coming to it for essential power inputs and signal outputs, can be covered with a hundred million circuit elements in miniature. An interconnected pile of such devices, stored in a protective case the size of a pint jar, drawing a hundred watts of power from the electric lines, would be the equivalent in complexity of many thousands of the great electronic computers of our day. It might handle pulses with a similar speed; it might have stored in it, on a plate or two, the information of a sizable reference library; it might have a logical design rendering it capable of logical intercombinations of all the data it contains. It is not hard to conceive that its topmost plate would in fact be a mosaic of tiny flashing fluorescent elements, under pulse control. Then on that plate it could display as does the TV tube any writing, computations, pictures, which the combining circuits can produce. A few small microphones, even a loudspeaker or two, again driven by the complex circuitry, might enable the device to engage in conversation, receiving data or questions from those who address it, and responding orally. The whole device, once we knew how to do it, might be produced in a few days time, along with very many duplicates. It does not seem to me bizarre to expect a structure of this sort to be capable of the creation of novelty more or less of the same order as that produced by the brain of man. Indeed, it will have a similar structural complexity; with fewer individual parts, but those working more rapidly, it ought to be comparable with the mind. Of course, what sort of things it can do, what it learns and knows and answers, will be the end-point, not of long natural selection, nor of interaction with the natural and social environment, but of its human designers' intentions. It will not be a human mind, but some sort of a mind it can be.

There are of course steps implied which no man has yet taken. The device here described—due to the imagination of K. R. Shoulders—is far more than we could now make. We do not know how to construct circuitry which will do what we call

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thinking, even if we do have the hope that we can build mechanisms with enough meaningful parts—some thousands of millions—to make that possible. Above all, we do not know how to build such intricate devices on a statistical, rather than on a logical, pattern. For just as the brain can and does lose in adult life tens of thousands of cells a day, so such a complex device must be secure against failures of many of its myriad component parts. It was K. S. Lashley who slashed and slashed across the brain of a rat, unable to find any single cut which would destroy the learned ability to run a maze. The more cuts, the less well the rat's mind worked, but the drop in effectiveness was roughly proportionate to the amount of damage. This ability to transcend particular defects is what such a super-circuit must have. We are not sure how to do that yet, but there are many approaches to the problem. Combined with the marvelous micro-techniques, these new orders of more-than-logical computers will, I believe, make the device described above not a dream but reality. Of course, pulling out the electric plug, like cutting the key artery, will end the mind's function. But failures of many individual micro-components, like the death of the single neutrons of the brain, will in general cause no catastrophic failure.

It is moreover true that no one will quite know in advance how such a device will act, since no one will quite know how it was constructed. It must be made by repetitive, but not simple-minded, orders from a fast computer. It will perform in a way which will depend upon many circumstances of its construction, and still more, upon its "training," the data stored in it, and the early data it receives. In short, it will have a kind of individuality which we nowadays associate less with machines than with living things. For this machine is so complex that its significant structure must needs be individual. The material basis for individuality will be there, like the material basis for what we call mind. It will be no surprise to find those more subtle properties there as well. As for self-consciousness, that discussion I will leave to others.

The prospect of such devices seems today to make the philosophy of levels of integration more and more attractive. The machine here described, if it comes to exist, will surely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bridge the gap between man and machine, between the inanimate and the conscious. But there will remain deep differences. It is plain, too, that here is a clear example of the transformation of a simple quantitative matter, the number of interconnected parts, into the profound difference in quality between a routine mechanism and an inanimate mind. Pressed to a new order of intensity, complexity has become something genuinely novel. I do not expect to see such pint-size mind-machines, though I do expect they will become real in fifty years. When they do, they will exemplify once again the insight of the old Hegel in all his penetrating confusion.

Now, more than ever before

your friends need to know the facts about Cuba and Latin America. Our new

CUBA PACKET

combines 8 back issues of MR including the following articles

Aguirre, Manuel Agustin	Report from Ecuador
American in Havana	A Letter from Cuba
An Observer	The Coming Latin American Revolution
Baran, Paul	Cuba Invaded
Castro, Fidel	Indemnity for Prisoners
Cárdenas, Lazaro	Letter to the UN
Guevara, Che	Cuba: Exceptional Case?
Huberman, Leo	The Truth About Cuba
	Which Way for Latin America?
Jagan, Cheddi	Socialism and Democracy
Johnson, Paul	The Plundered Continent
Juliao, Francisco	Brazil, A Christian Country
Morray, J. P.	Cuba and Communism
	Questions and Answers on Cuba
Reeves, Nancy	Women of the New Cuba
Schleifer, Marc	Cuban Notebook

Only $2
(list price $4.35)

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to:
Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS FULL EMPLOYMENT?

BY PHILIP EDEN

The deep and terrible scourge of unemployment during the 1930's forced people to grapple with this problem and ask themselves; Is this necessary? Is there not some way to avoid or minimize this incredible waste of human resources?

Two experiences lent great force and urgency to these questions. The first was the growing awareness that there was hardly any unemployment in the Soviet Union. Thus the Left argued that unemployment was not the result of natural forces but was made by man and could be corrected by man, that the reorganization of society along socialist lines would solve the problem. The second was that the problem of unemployment in the United States was solved only by World War II, a fact which was extraordinarily thought-provoking. Was it possible that this capitalist system could provide jobs for all only at the cost of the mass slaughter and destruction of war? Could it solve one problem, unemployment, only by enmeshing us in another and worse problem, war?

The taunts from the Left were bitter and effective. The common man lifted his head and began to listen and think.

The Concept of Full Employment

The concept of full employment under capitalism in time of peace derives from these experiences and was developed and presented most clearly perhaps by William H. Beveridge in his classic *Full Employment in a Free Society* which was published in England during World War II. This book epitomized the thinking of large numbers of Keynesian economists both in the United States and England.

How did Beveridge define full employment? From the out-

Philip Eden, of the research department of the West Coast longshoremen's union, is one of the country's leading experts on the measurement of unemployment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set he made it very clear that full employment did not mean no unemployment. He recognized that even in a progressive, rapidly-growing capitalism, there would be a certain amount of what he called "frictional" unemployment. This is of two types: first, the seasonal unemployment which is due to changes in weather (as distinct from seasonal unemployment due to changes in models or fashions); second, normal turnover as workers leave one job and take another.

Although the socialist countries claim they have no unemployment, they must have some minimal amount of frictional unemployment. They do have seasonal changes of weather with at least some associated unemployment. There is some job shifting and mobility of population. There are unquestionably technological changes and resulting shifts of personnel. For those who are concretely interested in minimizing unemployment it would be more useful to have statistics on these various forms of unemployment than to be told that there is absolutely *no* unemployment.

According to Beveridge, full employment means not only that there are more vacant jobs than unemployed men, it also means that the number of unemployed is minimal and that the duration of their unemployment is relatively short. He stresses this point again and again: "The demand for manpower must be such that no one ever expects to stand by for long or has any need to do so. There must always be jobs waiting to be filled. That is the test of full employment." Or, put in another way, "the labor market should always be a seller's market rather than a buyer's market." In defense of this proposition Beveridge advanced a decisive reason of principle. The unemployed man who cannot sell his labor suffers a personal catastrophe. The employer who cannot buy labor suffers only inconvenience and the loss of profits. There is a different order of harmfulness associated with the former as compared with the latter.

How Much Frictional Unemployment?

How much frictional, short-term unemployment is compatible with a condition of "full employment"?

One way to answer this question would be to take the level of unemployment when the economy has worked best.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beveridge rejects this approach primarily because part of the unemployment even in boom periods is due to "deficient demand, locally-misdirected demand, and a disorganized labor market."

The approach he adopts instead is to consider what factors are beyond the control of the community and to estimate the amount of unemployment caused by each of these factors. First is the weather. Seasonal unemployment in Britain at the time Beveridge was writing his book was estimated at 2 percent of the civilian labor force, of which half, or 1 percent, he considered attributable to seasonal changes in weather. Second is technological and economic progress which is always eliminating some jobs and creating others. Beveridge allowed quite generously for this factor, estimating that one-quarter of the whole labor force might be out of work for an average of two weeks a year because of normal turnover. This amounts to another 1 percent unemployment.

These two add up to 2 percent unemployment; and Beveridge maintained that if Britain were a closed economic system, it would be reasonable to accept this 2 percent figure. But Britain, being largely dependent on foreign trade, much of it outside her control, cannot prevent fluctuations in overseas demand. For this factor, Beveridge allowed an additional 1 percent unemployment, which he considered the price Britain must pay for the advantages of international trade.

By this process Beveridge arrived at a figure of 3 percent allowable unemployment under conditions of full employment in Britain.

If Beveridge were to apply similar reasoning to the United States today, he could do a more accurate job. The statistics on unemployment in the United States now are much more detailed than were those available to Beveridge in England during World War II. Moreover, we are fortunate in having a study made by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress entitled *The Extent and Nature of Frictional Unemployment*. This study examines unemployment during 1957, a year of relatively high employment and typical of the 1955-1957 boom period.

During this period 0.9 percent of the civilian labor force was seasonally unemployed. Here, as in Britain, this unemploy-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment is of two sorts. The first results from unavoidable variations in weather; the second results from social customs (such as the post-Christmas lull in retail trade) or commercial customs (such as the change in auto or TV models). Since the BLS does not attempt to give a quantitative division of seasonal unemployment into these two categories, let us adopt the short cut that Beveridge used, and consider that approximately half the total is climatic in origin. We may therefore estimate that for the U.S. some 0.5 percent of the civilian labor force would be seasonally and unavoidably unemployed in a period of full employment.

Next is the problem of an adequate allowance for turnover—for a shifting body of short-term unemployed. For Britain, Beveridge put the figure at 1 percent, but for the U.S. it seems reasonable to allow for a more rapid rate of technological change, hence for a somewhat higher rate of turnover. Let us therefore raise Beveridge's figure to 1.5 percent.

How much shall we add to allow for the fact that the U.S. is not a closed economy? Dependence on foreign trade is far less in the U.S. than in Britain. In 1957, for example, foreign trade accounted for over one fifth of Britain's national income compared to less than four percent of ours. Just to be consistent with Beveridge's approach, let us allow proportionately for this factor. He allowed one percent, we can allow one fifth as much, or 0.2 percent.

If we add 0.5 percent seasonal plus 1.5 percent normal turnover plus 0.2 percent foreign, we come to a total of 2.2 percent.

This is what I believe Beveridge would set as the figure of permissible frictional unemployment under conditions of full employment in the United States at the present time. In view of the arbitrary nature of the guesses which were necessarily made in order to arrive at this estimate, I would be the first to concede that it is a very rough approximation. Nevertheless, it provides an idea of the magnitudes involved. If we accept the concepts and premises of full employment as defined by Beveridge, it would be very difficult indeed to get much beyond a 3 percent level of permissible frictional unemployment. Moreover, there developed a consensus of opinion after the war that this was the right order of magnitude.

For example, E. A. Goldenweiser, discussing "Post War

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems and Policies" in the *Federal Reserve Bulletin* of February, 1945, puts the allowable amount of frictional unemployment associated with full employment at 3 1/3 percent.

And in 1947, the U.S. Department of Labor made projections of "Full Employment Patterns, 1950" which allowed 3.4 percent for minimum frictional unemployment under full employment conditions. Neither of these estimates was supported in any detail, and one gets the feeling that they represented pretty much an acceptance of the Beveridge figures, rather than the fruit of any independent work.

The Struggle for a Full Employment Bill

This, then, is the concept of full employment that arose out of the crucible of the depressed 30's and the experience of the war. It was popularized in the CIO pamphlet *Jobs For All,* and in the slogan "Sixty Million Jobs" which made full employment a major factor in the sweeping Democratic Party victory in the 1944 elections. With this mandate, the administration presented Congress with a Full Employment Bill of 1945 which declared:

> All Americans able to work and desiring to work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment. . . . The Federal government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment, that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able and desiring to work.

The struggle over this measure was a class struggle. On one side were labor unions, liberals, and others who supported the idea of a seller's market for labor. On the other side were those employers who, in the words of Professor Pierson of Yale, "will be in favor of policies designed to perpetuate a *large normal volume* of unemployment in order to keep the upper hand in the process of bargaining over wages." (John H. G. Pierson, *Full Employment,* 1941, p. 33.)

The outcome of this struggle was embodied in the Employment Act of 1946. Note first the significant change in the title. The Employment Act of 1946 omits any statement that all Americans are entitled to an opportunity for employment. In addition, the federal government's responsibility to assure ade-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quate employment opportunities is limited by the phrase "all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy." In place of a commitment to assure continuing full employment, the government assumed responsibility for promoting "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," and for creating conditions under which there will be job opportunities. Here again, however, this responsibility was to be carried out "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare." Even more significant was the omission of any reference to specific methods which the government was supposed to employ to fulfill its obligations under the Act.

So what came out of the struggle was not *guarantees* of *full* employment by *specific actions* of the government, but rather *general* policies to *promote* a condition of *high* employment. The difference is great. Moreover, nowhere in this act is there any standard for measuring what is meant by "maximum employment."

Have We Ever Achieved Full Employment?

The "allowable level" of less than 3 percent frictional unemployment during periods of full employment was not only achieved but bettered during the war years. This was accomplished however at a cost which no reasonable person would be willing to pay in peacetime in terms of loss of leisure, disruption of home life, loss of education for the young, compulsion to stay in certain jobs, etc.

More relevant is the record in the boom periods since the war:

	Boom Period (Q=Quarter)	Unemployment rate (seasonally adjusted) percent
(1)	1948	3.7
(2)	2 Q 1951 - 3 Q 1953 (Korean War)	3.0
(3)	3 Q 1955 - 3 Q 1957	4.1
(4)	2 Q 1959 - 2 Q 1960	5.2
(5)	Mar. 1962	5.5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here again, we can put aside the 1951-1953 boom as being a war period. It can be readily seen that in peacetime, even in boom years, we have regularly exceeded the allowable level of 3 percent unemployment. More alarming, we are apparently exceeding it by an ever-increasing margin in each successive boom.

Actually, these are official figures of totally unemployed active job seekers which understate unemployment by considerable amounts.

We can illustrate the degree of understatement by taking a closer look at the fourth boom, from the second quarter of 1959 to the second quarter of 1960. The official figure of totally unemployed was 5.2 percent. To this should be added (a) hidden unemployment among those classified as not in the labor force, 1.8 percent; and (b) the full-time equivalent of involuntary part-time unemployment, 2.8 percent. The 5.2 percent grand total therefore comes to no less than 9.8 percent of the labor force.

These figures are rough approximations. The figure on hidden unemployment is based on a study I made in 1959. It represents those who would normally be working in 1959-1960 if the employment conditions of 1956 had continued—the unemployed who are no longer active job seekers because they have failed to find jobs and have been forced to become housewives, students, retired, etc. These people are simply dropped out of the labor force by the official Labor Department estimators.*

The figure on the full-time equivalent of involuntary part-time unemployment is from the January, 1962, Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The true figure of total unemployment in the 1959-1960 boom was thus almost 10 percent, or over three times the allowable level of 3 percent. Of course, the picture is far more distressing during periods of recession.

Full Employment à la CEA

With this background on what constitutes full employment

* This propensity to drop considerable numbers from the labor force was again illustrated in March, 1962, when the labor force was reported to be some 300,000 below the figure of one year earlier. In view of the normal growth of the population of working age, this means that about 1.5 million people were somehow dropped from the labor force in a one-year period.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the extent to which we have failed to achieve it, we are in position to evaluate the recent announcement of the President's Council of Economic Advisers that 4 percent is "a reasonable and prudent full employment target for stabilization policy." While the January, 1962, Report of the CEA loosely uses the words *full employment* it clearly means *high* employment. The entire discussion revolves around the implementation of the Employment Act of 1946, where, as we have seen, full employment is never mentioned. The 4 percent figure is, according to the CEA, "a feasible interim goal [which] must reflect a balancing of employment and production objectives with other considerations of national policy, within the limits set by the existing characteristics of the economy." The most important of these other objectives, says the CEA, is to prevent a "demand-induced inflation." "A situation in which this is achieved can appropriately be described as one of 'full employment' in the sense that further expansion of expenditures for goods and services, and for labor to produce them, would be met only by minor increases in employment and output, and by major increases in prices and wages."

The CEA spells out what this means by citing the 1955-1957 boom experience when the unemployment rate averaged about 4 percent. "During this period," we read, "prices and wages rose at a rate which impaired the competitiveness of some U.S. products in world markets."

Although the CEA enters a general disclaimer that such upward pressures on prices and wages are "a permanent and systematic feature of our economy when it is operating in the neighborhood of 4 percent unemployment," they do conclude that "the experience of 1955-57 is nevertheless sobering, and experience at higher levels of activity will be needed to indicate whether stabilization policy can now undertake a more ambitious assignment than 4 percent unemployment."

If we accept the premises and qualifications of the CEA, then a 4 percent level of unemployment is not an unreasonable interim goal as a standard for *high* employment. But under no circumstances should this be called "frictional unemployment." As compared to conditions of full employment, it is partly frictional and partly a surplus of manpower designed to hold

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down wage levels and stiffen labor discipline.

The picture that emerges is that of the CEA attempting to steer the U.S. economy between the Scylla of unemployment and the Charybdis of inflation. Less than full employment, the President's advisers are telling us, must be accepted in order to maintain stable prices and wages.

Beveridge, on the other hand, faced this issue squarely by proposing continued price controls. "It would be unreasonable," he said, "to expect the trade unions to abstain from using their bargaining strength to the full, unless the Government can give them some assurance that it is pursuing a policy of stable prices." This price policy should, he argued, maintain a stable value of money in terms of necessaries, with wages rising both in money terms and in real terms as productivity rises.

Beveridge knew that to achieve full employment under capitalism a price would have to be paid. This price includes a degree of control over the economy in order to make it work in a way it never worked before. Capitalism does not normally tend to produce full employment. Quite the contrary, it normally generates unemployment as a dynamo generates electricity. Capitalists prefer to have what Marx called "an industrial reserve army"; and in fact capitalism normally creates one.

The Congress that passed the Employment Act of 1946 was not willing to pay this price. The CEA is merely being guided by the policy adopted by Congress in 1946. The rationale used by the CEA can justify 4 percent, 6 percent, or any percent unemployment. The CEA can be criticized for using words like "full employment" too loosely, but theirs is not the original sin.

Meanwhile, the simple fact is that we are a long way from full employment and we are getting farther away from it every year. As the labor force grows more rapidly, and as technological displacement accelerates during the sixties, it will probably get much worse.

Drastic reduction of military budgets could be a historic political and economic opportunity for the United States. But finding desirable ways of spending 40 to 50 billion dollars a year (about 10 percent of the gross national product) requires an orderly, planned effort.

—*Prof. Seymour Melman, Columbia University*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORK AND PROPERTY

BY R. H. TAWNEY

In the March issue of MR, we wrote that "as a tribute to Tawney's memory, we plan to publish in an early issue a collection of characteristic quotations from his two best known works." After reading *The Acquisitive Society* and *Equality* again, however, we decided that one long continuous passage would serve the purpose better. The following is from the chapter entitled "The Vicious Circle" from *The Acquisitive Society,* pp. 131-138.* We hope that it will inspire MR readers to read or re-read the works of one of the great English socialists of our time.—The Editors

No conceivable system of industrial organization can secure industrial peace, if by "peace" is meant a complete absence of disagreement. What could be secured would be that disagreements should not flare up into a beacon of class warfare. If every member of a group puts something into a common pool on condition of taking something out, they may still quarrel about the size of the shares, as children quarrel over cake; but if the total is known and the claims admitted, that is all they can quarrel about, and, since they all stand on the same footing, any one who holds out for more than his fellows must show some good reason why he should get it. But in industry the claims are not all admitted, for those who put nothing in demand to take something out; both the total to be divided and the proportion in which the division takes place are sedulously concealed; and those who preside over the distribution of the pool and control what is paid out of it have a direct interest in securing as large a share as possible for themselves and in allotting as small a share as possible to others. If one contributor takes less, so far from it being evident that the gain will go to some one who has put something in and has as good a right as himself, it may go to some one who has put in nothing and has no right at all. If another claims more, he may secure it, without plundering a fellow-worker, at the expense of a sleeping partner who is believed to plunder both. In practice, since there is no clear principle determining what they ought to take, both take all that they can get.

* Copyright, 1920, by Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., renewed, 1948, by R. H. Tawney. Reprinted by permission of the publishers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In such circumstances denunciations of the producer for exploiting the consumer miss the mark. They are inevitably regarded as an economic version of the military device used by armies which advance behind a screen of women and children, and then protest at the brutality of the enemy in shooting non-combatants. They are interpreted as evidence, not that a section of the producers are exploiting the remainder, but that a minority of property-owners, which is in opposition to both, can use its economic power to make efforts directed against those who consume much and produce little rebound on those who consume little and produce much. And the grievance, of which the Press makes so much, that some workers may be taking too large a share compared with others, is masked by the much greater grievance, of which it says nothing whatever, that some idlers take any share at all. The abolition of payments which are made without any corresponding economic service is thus one of the indispensable conditions both of economic efficiency and industrial peace, because their existence prevents different classes of workers from restraining each other, by uniting them all against the common enemy. Either the principle of industry is that of function, in which case slack work is only less immoral than no work at all; or it is that of grab, in which case there is no morality in the matter. But it cannot be both. And it is useless either for property-owners or for Governments to lament the mote in the eye of the trade unions as long as, by insisting on the maintenance of functionless property, they decline to remove the beam in their own.

The truth is that only workers can prevent the abuse of power by workers, because only workers are recognized as possessing any title to have their claims considered. And the first step to preventing the exploitation of the consumer by the producer is simple. It is to turn all men into producers, and thus to remove the temptation for particular groups of workers to force their claims at the expense of the public, by removing the valid excuse that such gains as they may get are taken from those who at present have no right to them, because they are disproportionate to service or obtained for no service at all. Indeed, if work were the only title to payment, the danger of the community being exploited by highly organized groups of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

producers would largely disappear. For, when no payments were made to non-producers, there would be no debatable ground for which to struggle, and it would become evident that if any one group of producers took more, another must put up with less.

Under such conditions a body of workers who used their strong strategic position to extort extravagant terms for themselves at the expense of their fellow-workers might properly be described as exploiting the community. But at present such a statement is meaningless. It is meaningless because before the community can be exploited the community must exist, and its existence in the sphere of economics is today not a fact but only an aspiration. The procedure by which, whenever any section of workers advance demands which are regarded as inconvenient by their masters, they are denounced as a band of anarchists who are preying on the public may be a convenient weapon in an emergency, but, once it is submitted to analysis, it is logically self-destructive. It has been applied within recent years, to the postmen, to the engineers, to the policemen, to the miners and to the railway men, a population with their dependents, of some eight million persons; and in the case of the last two the whole body of organized labor made common cause with those of whose exorbitant demands it was alleged to be the victim. But when these workers and their sympathizers are deducted, what is "the community" which remains? It is a naive arithmetic which produces a total by subtracting one by one all the items which compose it; and the art which discovers the public interest by eliminating the interests of successive sections of the public smacks of the rhetorician rather than of the statesman.

The truth is that at present it is idle to seek to resist the demands of any group of workers by appeals to "the interests of society," because today, as long as the economic plane alone is considered, there is not one society but two, which dwell together in uneasy juxtaposition, like Sinbad and the Old Man of the Sea, but which in spirit, in ideals, and in economic interest, are worlds asunder. There is the society of those who live by labor, whatever their craft or profession, and the society of those who live on it. All the latter cannot command the sacrifices or the loyalty which are due to the former, for they have no title which will bear inspection. The instinct to ignore that tragic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

division instead of ending it is amiable, and sometimes generous. But it is a sentimentality which is like the morbid optimism of the consumptive who dares not admit even to himself the virulence of his disease. As long as the division exists, the general body of workers, while it may suffer from the struggles of any one group within it, nevertheless supports them by its sympathy, because all are interested in the results of the contest carried on by each. Different sections of workers will exercise mutual restraint only when the termination of the struggle leaves them face to face with each other, and not as now, with the common enemy. The ideal of a united society in which no one group uses its power to encroach upon the standards of another is, in short, unattainable, except through the preliminary abolition of functionless property.

Those to whom a leisure class is part of an immutable order without which civilization is inconceivable, dare not admit, even to themselves, that the world is poorer, not richer, because of its existence. So, when, as now it is important that productive energy should be fully used, they stamp and cry, and write to *The Times* about the necessity for increased production, though all the time they themselves, their way of life and expenditure, and their very existence as a leisure class, are among the causes why production is not increased. In all their economic plans they make one reservation, that, however necessitous the world may be, it shall still support *them*. But men who work do not make that reservation, nor is there any reason why they should; and appeals to them to produce more wealth because the public needs it usually fall upon deaf ears, even when such appeals are not involved in the ignorance and misapprehensions which often characterize them.

For the workman is not the servant of the consumer, for whose sake greater production is demanded, but of shareholders, whose primary aim is dividends, and to whom all production, however futile or frivolous, so long as it yields dividends, is the same. It is useless to urge that he should produce more wealth for the community, unless at the same time he is assured that it is the community which will benefit in proportion as more wealth is produced. If every unnecessary charge upon coal-getting had been eliminated, it would be reasonable that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miners should set a much needed example by refusing to extort better terms for themselves at the expense of the public. But there is no reason why they should work for lower wages or longer hours as long as those who are today responsible for the management of the industry conduct it with "the extravagance and waste" stigmatized by the most eminent official witness before the Coal Commission, or why the consumer should grumble at the rapacity of the miner as long as he allows himself to be mulcted by swollen profits, the costs of an ineffective organization, and unnecessary payments to superfluous middlemen.

If today the miner or any other workman produces more, he has no guarantee that the result will be lower prices rather than higher dividends and larger royalties, any more than, as a workman, he can determine the quality of the wares which his employer supplies to customers, or the price at which they are sold. Nor, as long as he is directly the servant of a profit-making company, and only indirectly the servant of the community, can any such guarantee be offered him. It can be offered only in so far as he stands in an immediate and direct relation to the public for whom industry is carried on, so that, when all costs have been met, any surplus will pass to it, and not to private individuals. It will be accepted only in so far as the workers in each industry are not merely servants executing orders, but themselves have a collective responsibility for the character of the service, and can use their organizations not merely to protect themselves against exploitation, but to make positive contributions to the administration and development of their industry.

Riches are not gotten by personal labor, but by causing others to labor.
—*Paul Lafargue*

The subordination of reason to the assumptions of the existing order seems to me in the long run wholly unacceptable.
—*E. H. Carr, What Is History?*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Confidence in United States Economy

"Every consumer and business man in America . . . can safely spend and invest tomorrow with real confidence in the long range future of the United States of America," said President Kennedy in his August 13, 1962, broadcast on the soundness of the United States economy. The President gave this assurance on the basis of developments during the past year and a half: national product up 10 percent, industrial production up 15 percent, unemployment down 23 percent, corporate profits after taxes up 26 percent. Since "the dark days when Franklin Roosevelt entered his office, we have constructed strong safeguards against depressions, against bank failures, against substandard wages, in watered stock, in widespread farm foreclosures." "We know more now, much more than we did in the past, about relieving the hardships of unemployment and about cushioning our economy against big business cycles." Consequently, "You and I may have confidence in our economy because it is solidly built on the largest output, on the highest wages and profits and the most bountiful standard of living that any people have ever known." (*New York Times,* August 14, 1962.)

After sounding this optimistic note on our economic solidity, President Kennedy added these extraordinary admissions: "We have had a five-year period where we've been more or less standing still economically, at least in comparison to the countries of Western Europe and Japan. . . . Now we must be concerned with the forward movement of our economy. Employment, income, profit, construction and investment must all move up more quickly than they have been doing this summer. . . . We will not find full employment in this country . . . until we make better use of the work force and the plants than we now have; until we've cleared away the effects not only of two recessions, but five years of slowdowns. The fact of the matter was that the economy in January of last year was sick and it was sick not only because of the 1960-61 recession

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but also because of the recession of 1958. The fact of the matter is that there has been a slowdown in our growth, and therefore in our employment, and therefore in our use of our present facilities—really since the beginning of 1958."

How is Mr. Kennedy's about-face to be achieved? By active federal government intervention in the economy. Here are the President's proposals as he listed them in his broadcast: (1) Enactment of the investment tax credit; (2) a "bill to step up Federal aid to state and local public works"; (3) a "bill to provide for youth employment opportunities" ("we have in this country 1,000,000 boys and girls who are out of school and out of work.") (4) renewal of "our federal backstop to unemployment compensation"; (5) "we need to enlarge our markets through the Trade Expansion Bill."

First on the list and the key item in the Kennedy program is tax reduction, particularly for corporations and personal taxpayers in the higher income brackets. This approach is based on the assumption that the money "saved" by corporate and individual tax-payers will be invested in more capital goods or spent on items for personal consumption. Even if the assumption is sound (and it has not been put to the test), what will be gained by capital investments in an economy which, according to the President's own showing, is bogged down in excess productive capacity and "five years of slowdowns"?

Tax-cutting as a wonder drug to meet the ups and downs of the business cycle is an unproved part of the Keynesian program. The crucial aspect of President Kennedy's proposals for dealing with an economy which has been "more or less standing still" for five years is intervention by the federal government, to save business.

Thirty years ago, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation handled the Great Depression by shoveling aid from the federal treasury into the bankrupt coffers of banks, public utilities, and industries. The President is now proposing to rely on the same policy in the 1960's. In a word, the periodic overexpansion and excess capacity of planless private enterprise is to be remedied by government backing. There is no suggestion that private business should help itself to get out of the bog of economic stagnation into which it has wandered during its frantic search

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for more and more profits.

President Kennedy's "real confidence" in the future of the United States private-enterprise economy is called into question not only by the five years of economic stagnation which began in 1957 and the stock market collapse of 1962. With the "strong safeguards against depressions" to which the President referred, why have minor recessions continued at their usual intervals in 1949, 1953, 1957, and 1960? And is the economic stage now set for a repetition of the rolling economic readjustment that began in 1929?

Explosive Revolution

Modern man is pushed about, buffeted, coerced, and threatened as well as benefitted by a transformation of human society that began shouldering and jostling into the western and southern European foreground early in the 18th century. This transformation is the result of a series of discoveries and inventions which led to the rise of present-day science and technology. In the course of the transformation, long established ways of economic, political, and social life have been broken up, tossed aside, and replaced by new patterns of thought and action.

Science and technology are making over human society fundamentally and swiftly in the European cradle where they spent their infancy and in the North American foster home where they have made some of their most spectacular advances. Within the lifetime of the present generation, science and technology have moved in seven-league boots into three score Asian, Latin American, and African countries, dominating their policy-making and shaping their future. "Without exception these countries are now launched on long-range plans for accelerated economic development and social change. To implement vitally important parts of their plans, these same countries are borrowing, *ad libitum,* from many different sources, and what they imitate, they are adapting to their cultural and national habit patterns. In all the borrowing, adapting and welter of interchange, two indispensable components, those of science and industrial technology, seem increasingly . . . to rise above and beyond a sea of differences." These sentences are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quoted from a new book *Organization, Automation and Society; The Scientific Revolution in Industry,* by Professor Robert A. Brady of the University of California.

The scientific revolution has four aspects: "Each is closely related to the others. . . . First is the chemical revolution in the materials foundation of industry. Second is the standards and specifications revolution in the criteria for selecting the best methods, processes, products, and the like. Third is the electronics and automation revolution in the processing methods of industry. And fourth is the revolution (at the moment, primarily atomic) in the systems of energy supply."

Industrialization, writes Professor Brady, is everywhere the order of the day. "By it most of life is bound to be altered in detail, when not wholly transformed." This is the case in the older centers of industrialization. It is equally evident in less advanced areas. "In either environment, the new developments confront, or will soon confront, society with the ultimate problem: the rational organization of production on the most comprehensive and technically efficient basis possible."

Rationalization, purpose, planning, blue-printing, and detailed direction are necessary: first, to conserve rapidly diminishing natural resources; second, because the scientific revolution is animated by an inner logic based on "ordering disciplines of integration and synchronization." Furthermore, "the new scientific-minded industrial technology is . . . once begun, irreversible. On its account most developed and undeveloped countries alike seem prepared to modify, alter, or, *in extremis,* sacrifice whatever stands in the way in the forms of law and custom, politics and religion, economics and standards of living."

Organization, Automation and Society is a large book (481 pages) packed with informed details on the impact of the scientific revolution in industry. It describes the juggernaut of mechanism and mechanization which promises to lift humanity out of poverty, dirt, ignorance, war-making, suffering, superstition, resignation, apathy, and despair to a planet-wide level of peace, cooperation, abundance, and human brotherhood.

Conference for World Peace

More than two thousand representatives from 120 coun-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries assembled in Moscow on July 9 for a week of meetings and discussions on disarmament and peace. This conference was by all odds the most widely representative pro-peace gathering ever held. It was carefully prepared and well managed. In larger assemblages and smaller panel groups it heard the war-peace issue threshed out by spokesmen of many viewpoints, including strong anti-Communist representatives from the United States. In its final session it adopted, by an all-but unanimous vote, a ringing call to the peoples of the world to take the steps necessary to stop testing and producing atomic and nuclear weapons, end the armament race, begin programmed disarmament, and pave the way for world-wide peace and friendship.

Conservatives, Wreckers, and Builders

Among opposing forces currently reshaping human society, disintegration and integration are leading the field. Disintegrative forces tear down, pull apart, disunite, dismember, decentralize. Integrative forces work in opposite directions. Results at one end of the social spectrum are classed as individualism, at the other end as collectivism.

One of the outstanding social developments between the Napoleonic Wars and the War of Empires (1914-1918) was the disintegration of European feudal society and the integration, first, of competitive capitalism and later of monopoly capitalism. European feudalism, lacking effective means of communication, transportation, and fabrication, never achieved effective integration. European capitalism, with its roads, railways, steamboats, automobiles, airplanes, telegraph, telephone, radio, and mechanized-automated mass production, was able to establish a web of trade, commerce, industry, and finance which extended beyond Europe into every corner of the planet.

Politically, these integrative forces expressed themselves in the tightly knit European national states and the half dozen 19th-century European empires which literally girdled the earth.

Economically, the integrative processes that moved through competitive to monopoly capitalism were rapid and thoroughgoing. Politically, they remained incomplete. The separate European sovereign states remained separate and sovereign despite repeated attempts to integrate them into a United States of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe or a United States of the World. It was these separate, sovereign, competing European nations which ganged up and fought the War of 1914-1918, and began its sequel, the War of 1939-1945.

War is an implement or instrument in the power struggle waged between factions, classes, nations, empires. At one stage it is an integrative force, a state maker, used by the tribes of Latinum to unify Italy or by the English to unify the British Isles. Coupled with communication, transportation, and trade, war is also an empire-builder. The Roman Empire, the Spanish Empire, and the British Empire all used professional military organizations to achieve and retain their power over colonial and dependent peoples.

War at another stage is an instrument of disintegration. It was the Wars of the Empires, in 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, which tore down the imposing structure of 19th-century European imperialism. On the other side of the picture, it was the Wars of Independence which broke the British imperial grip on North America and the Spanish imperial grip on Latin America.

The half century following 1914 witnessed the tearing down of world empires and the building up of scores of independent nations, particularly in Asia and Africa. This building-up or integrative process in the newly independent states has two essential different phases. The first phase is the integration within each homeland of the diverse groups whose united efforts won independence from imperial overlords. Independence completes a disintegrative process and opens the way for domestic or national integration—politically, economically, culturally. We are able to follow the day-to-day course of nation-building in the newly independent countries of Asia-Africa.

Beyond national integration the builders face a second problem made urgent by the rapid power-age advances in communication, transportation, and mechanized production: the political and economic integration of the nations. Political integration has scored many victories since 1900, especially in the United Nations. Economic integration is still specialized as in the British Commonwealth and the European Common Market or regional as in the United States or the socialist bloc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

BY FRANK KOFSKY

The chief merit of *Student,* by David Horowitz, lies not in its worth as literature.* Indeed, it gives evidence of having been hurriedly put together, and some of the best writing consists of quotations from other sources (e.g., the moving account by Michael Rossman of the last hours of the vigil outside San Quentin the night of Caryl Chessman's execution).

Nonetheless, for anyone who wishes to comprehend something of the virtues and shortcomings, temper and outlook of that awkwardly named beast, the student movement, recourse to this first-hand account of recent student political activity at the University of California in Berkeley by a teaching assistant in the English Department will prove necessary.

What makes this such a fascinating sociological document is not David Horowitz's relating of the events themselves—many of which have in any case since been re-enacted on various campuses around the country—but the extent to which he has succeeded in capturing the exact *tone* of "the movement."

Perhaps I can illustrate this with an incident which occurred in the course of a visit I had occasion to pay to the University last spring. Emerging from a building at noon, I caught sight of a peace march solemnly wending its way across campus from what, as I subsequently learned, was the "free speech" area.** As the line silently passed by, I was struck speechless; those people were

---

A graduate student at Berkeley in biophysics from 1957 to 1961, Frank Kofsky left in April, 1961, "because I did not want to be trapped in the physical sciences." At the time of writing this article, he was a jazz critic and free-lance writer planning to return to formal studies to become a historian.

* Paperback, Ballantine Books, 1962, 160 pp., $.50.

** It is indicative of the extent to which our regard for free speech has deteriorated—as well as a mordant comment on the character of the administrators of our leading universities — that it should be thought desirable to relegate it carefully to one out-of-the-way area of the campus.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

positively *radiant* with an aura of—what? Morality? Commitment? Call it what you will. the point is that it was there, and any reasonably sensitive observer could detect it—and very nearly touch it.

This vitality and impassioned air, which permeate Horowitz's book like an effluvium, currently provide the ambience within which student political activity takes place. If that accounts for much of the strength of *Student,* it must also take the responsibility for many of the weaknesses.

Not surprisingly, then, one discovers that the author's political baptism, like that of many another student at the time (this reviewer included), came with the hunger strike of Frederick Moore, Jr. If not the sole cause, it was undoubtedly a key one in igniting the spark of an already-smoldering student awakening.

> The testament of Fred Moore [Horowitz writes] was startling because it was genuine, because it came from the heart. And because he was like us, his courage was a challenge to ours, the strength of his belief made us reconsider our own beliefs.
>
> The story itself is simple. On Monday, October 19, 1959 at 7:45 a.m., Fred Moore, an entering freshman from Virginia, walked onto the steps of Sproul Hall (the administration building) with a petition, a statement and a sign that he had made, and sat down. The sign said:
>
> Non-Compulsory
> ROTC
> This seven day fast
> is undertaken to
> express my belief
> that the University
> of California should
> respect conscience.

By the end of the second day, Fred Moore's fast had come to an end with his withdrawal from the University, but his enormous bravery in challenging what Paul Goodman calls The Organized System had pricked the conscience of his peers, and his action helped give rise to a wave of youthful protest that has yet to abate.

Contrary to Moore's hopeful belief, compulsory ROTC is still a feature of the University of California (although conscientious objectors may now be exempted). There, in abbreviated form, you have much of the history of the student movement: a great deal of fervent and sustained outcry, but pitifully few unmitigated triumphs.

Although Horowitz undeniably speaks the language of the student movement—really, a less pretentious title is desirable—it would be a mistake to conclude that his views are necessarily representative of it.

For one thing, since he is dealing with a context in which political activity frequently takes on the character of a moral reflex rather than a reasoned re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponse resulting from the thorough investigation of issues, Horowitz is too generous in imputing to the movement, which is primarily undergraduate in composition, the degree of political sophistication that his greater age and more extensive background as a graduate student have given him. (Generally, the graduate students, who have more time available to pursue their intellectual interests, tend to be the theorists, and undergraduates the activists. This unfortunate dichotomy between theory and practice has been reinforced, perhaps deliberately, by the University through excluding the graduates from student government by executive fiat.)

Horowitz is, for example, one of the few students I know of who is acquainted with that excellent though apparently little-read work by Professor John Somervillle, *The Communist Trials and the American Tradition.* Most of the students, if they are not actually indifferent to something as "theoretical" as, say, the classical Marxist-Leninist position on revolutions in advanced capitalist countries, are certainly uninformed about it. They do not oppose Congressional "investigations of Communism" on the ground that the CP is a revolutionary and not a putschist organization; their point of view is more simple and direct: inquiries into the area of ideas and associations are, *ipso facto,* wrong.

This admirably straightforward approach to issues has in large part been a protest against the disappearance of any kind of decent morality from American public life. The Establishment in all of its manifestations—from the administration in Washington right on down to the one on campus—has debased moral standards through elaborate systems of rationalization and sophistry, generously interlaced with Orwellian doublethink: *"Tell them? How in hell am I supposed to know what to tell them? Wait—I've got it! Tell them that we're preparing for war in order to achieve peace. See how they like that."*

Thus do the decision-makers evade the purely *human* consequences of their actions.

The students' reaction to this institutionalized dishonesty—incredulous disbelief rapidly turning to righteous outrage—was one of the things that allowed them to mobilize so rapidly in the early days. "If it's right, you do it—period," was how I once heard a student put it to a group of contemporaries. To a high degree that point of view still prevails, but it has now become an anachronism and even somewhat of a hindrance to more effective action.

There is quite another reason why one cannot say of any individual, as Horowitz does of one student in his final chapter on "New Politics," that he "speaks for a large segment of the most active students." The movement is simply too loose and ill-defined, comprising too

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many tendencies to admit of a single point of view, no matter how desirable that point of view might seem to the observer. Politically, there is a spectrum which extends from the Young Democrats and the youth affiliates of the Socialist and Communist Parties on the Right (yes, I said the *Right*) to the Trotskyites, a handful of Negro nationalists, an even tinier sprinkling of formal anarchists, and a rather larger group of independent radicals (from whence originates Horowitz's "New Politics") on the Left. Between those poles—or, perhaps more accurately, simply outside of the range which they define—lies the great majority of active students which has yet to identify itself with any single political persuasion.

It is even misleading to refer to student political activity as a "movement," because, microscopic in size though the student subculture may be, it is rife with further fragmentation. Cubanophiles are not active in peace groups, the latter are not involved in the civil rights struggle, and so it goes. I've got my issue, you've got yours, and only rarely the twain shall meet.

Further, there are cultural and social subdivisions: the jazz hippies, the folk-niks, the pot heads, the Zen freaks, the artsy-craftsy set, the semi-Beats (real Beats don't go to college), etc., etc.

To insist that the lines of demarcation which separate the various ingroups are "merely" ideological or anything of that sort, is worse than useless. The point is that while they can be transcended on "crisis" issues—police brutality in the San Francisco HUAC hearings, the invasion of Cuba, resumption of nuclear testing—the breakdown in communication among the students themselves and between them and the "adult" world is a very genuine obstacle to the realization of a unified, self-conscious student movement.

I have said above that Horowitz's book mirrors the flaws of the student movement; I would like to devote the remainder of my remarks to a discussion of what these flaws are. In fairness to the author, one must state explicitly that he is writing a popular journalistic account, and not a treatise on political tactics. However, there are certain attitudes manifest in *Student* which are sufficiently widespread to deserve a critical examination, and this seems as appropriate a time and place as any.

Were a brief but comprehensive diagnosis of the shortcomings of the student movement required of me, I would sum the matter up in the statement: the students haven't read Marx.

Let me hasten to add that by no means do I intend that in a literal sense. Particularly among the graduate students, many have some acquaintance with Marxist writings — Horowitz himself, from his discussion of "New Politics," appears to be a case in point. But, one must

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclude that on the whole the lessons have not been digested, for the movement has failed to develop an historical and political consciousness based on analysis of "the objective conditions." And, though we may poke fun at the jargon, the lack of such an analysis—itself the first requisite of good Marxist thought—ensures that the mistakes of the past will be repeated. This can be seen in the movement's choice of tactics and strategy, which, since they are decided without reference to any overall coherent world-view, vacillate perpetually between commendable, if somewhat impractical "idealism" on the one hand and what would have been called, in another day, opportunism on the other.

An example at this point will be relevant. The conservative opportunist faction of Slate—the student political party banned from campus last spring by the University of California administration in what was widely seen as a deep obeisance to the State Senate's Un-American Activities Committee—has consistently urged the point of view that it is possible to obtain concessions from the administration provided only that the students recognize its representatives as decent, reasonable men with whom it is possible to negotiate honestly and patiently.

These tactics have yet to bear fruit, for the simple reason that negotiations can be meaningful only when both sides have something to gain. Patently these students have nothing to offer the administration; their appeals for fair play and rationality are therefore brusquely rejected.

An analytical approach to the situation, on the other hand, might begin by enumerating some of the pressures on the administration which cause it to take a reactionary position vis-à-vis student political activity:

(1) Dependence on a conservative, rural-dominated legislature, both for funds and for continued hegemony over higher education in the face of intensifying competition from a burgeoning system of state colleges.

(2) Close partnership with the notoriously illiberal Atomic Energy Commission in financing and operating the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, at whose Livermore installation thermonuclear weapons are designed (is it merely coincidence that the present AEC Chairman was previously Chancellor of the University?).

(3) Constant friction between the city of Berkeley and the University because the latter siphons off tax revenue through its unceasing expansion while at the same time increasing its demands for various services from the city (the construction of 12-story student dormitories required the Berkeley Fire Department to purchase all new ladders—their old ones reached only 11 floors).

(4) Finally, the play-it-safe ideology of all bureaucrats, who operate within a system of in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitutionalized authority without responsibility, so tellingly analyzed by C. Wright Mills in *White Collar*.

Undoubtedly there are other, more complex factors at work; but just from these few it can be seen that, in any particular instance, for the administration to yield to the students requires that they be able to exert greater *force* as well as supplicate for fair treatment. In fact, the few instances in which the administration has given way can all be shown to be due to the students bringing to bear just those pressures to which it is most sensitive: a threatened lawsuit, unfavorable publicity tending to destroy the image the University wishes to project of itself, etc.

Horowitz's outlook in this matter is ambiguous, and in this respect he *does* speak for many of the students. In his two chapters on the Kerr Directives —an odious set of pronouncements unilaterally promulgated, amended, and interpreted by the administration as a means of arrogating to itself the privilege of controlling the scope of student political activity—he recognizes some of the reactionary influences to which the administration, with disgusting regularity, cops out. At the same time, he excoriates the administrators for so doing. This is clearly an attempt to have it both ways: once it is realized that bureaucracies function on principles of expediency, not of morality, there is no further point in condemning them for it; the appropriate task then becomes that of opposing the bureaucracy with the kinds of action which compel it to yield.

Even among the students who have read Marx, there seems to be a mood, in which Horowitz explicitly and enthusiastically concurs, that finds in Marxism something now outmoded and not a little *passé*. Partially in an effort to mimic the present fashions of the British New Left, and partially because these things do have profound contemporary relevance, Beat art, jazz, pot, and the like are hopefully seized upon—often in a superficial way—and the central problems of our times are dismissed from consciousness.* "What do you want to mess around with all that Marxist stuff for, anyhow?" was more or less the query that one disillusioned Marxist-turned-hippie student asked me. "Come on," he signalled impatiently, "let's go pick up on the new Charlie

* Let me make it clear that I am not guilty of thinking that Beat art, jazz, and other contemporary cultural phenomena are of no interest, from the point of view of either aesthetics or sociology; indeed, as a practicing jazz critic, this is hardly an attitude which can justifiably be ascribed to me. But at the same time, neither John Coltrane (I admit this reluctantly) nor Allan Ginsberg is going to rescue us from the crucial dilemma which capitalism and its Frankenstein creation, the Cold War, has posed for us. For that we shall have to have recourse to radical politics, and the logical place to begin is at the source.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mingus side."

Besides being prone to dogmatism, irrelevant, and generally un-hip, Marxism, as viewed by Horowitz, is seriously incompatible with individual liberties "guaranteed" us (as long as we don't try to exercise them) under the Bill of Rights. At least I take it that this is the point he wishes to make in his closing chapter when he opposes Christopher Caudwell's essay on bourgeois liberty in *Studies in a Dying Culture* to the first ten Amendments.

This illustrates precisely what I had in mind as the failure to make an objective historical analysis. The opposition between the Bill of Rights and Caudwell is more a product of Horowitz's interpretation than anything else. The Bill of Rights was devised as part of a system of law in what was envisioned as a stable democratic republic (no matter what Jefferson said about revolutions); Caudwell on the other hand, is discussing a highly fluid revolutionary situation in which the ruling class has been overthrown and all pre-existing social and political institutions, the law included, have ceased to function effectively. Presumably the former ruling class is attempting to regain power with all the means at its disposal, armed insurrection and civil war among them. Any government which is under actual physical—as opposed to ideological—attack may choose to establish the repressive measures which Caudwell discusses. While we are all familiar with the fact that governments may also use the pretext of physical attack to establish rigid controls—as the U.S. is in the process of doing, witness the McCarran Act—that does not necessarily invalidate the *principle;* it merely demands that, like all other human principles, it not be applied indiscriminately. But to infer, as Horowitz does, that such restrictive measures are necessarily a permanent consequence of a Marxist-Leninist revolution is simply not a permissible reading of Marx, Lenin, or Caudwell.

That Marxism and civil liberties are opposed in practice—this is a widely held, if erroneous conviction. Perhaps I may be pardoned if I dwell on it a bit more.

"Forty years is a long time to wait for a free press and an atmosphere of free intellectual discussion," Horowitz writes anent Marxism and the Soviet Union. Of course it is—and how much more so when one considers that the waiting had gone on for generations before that!

Here Horowitz is identifying Marxism with its practice in the Soviet Union—precisely the mistake he warns his reader against two pages later. Again lacking is the concrete analysis which would take into account Russia's economic condition in 1917, the cultural and intellectual traditions which were the Bolsheviks' legacy from the Tsars, and the hostility of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalist powers to the revolution. One gets the impression that Horowitz would have us be on guard lest a socialist revolution take us by surprise and steal away our liberties (such of them as still remain). Of all the thorny dilemmas which face the Left in this country, I would not imagine this to be one.

The reason I bring this up is because it illustrates how even a politically sophisticated, widely-read, and articulate observer such as David Horowitz can fall victim to some of the going stereotypes. Face it: we kiddies —as the teenage hero of Colin MacInes' *Absolute Beginners* might say—have had to grow up amidst all the intellectual rubbish of the 1950's: the witch-hunts, Korea, loyalty oaths, Hungary, de-Stalinization, and that whole bit. Obviously, the mass media have exploited these events for all they are worth in attempting to indoctrinate us with conventional values of flag-waving anti-Communism. And in associating Marxism almost inextricably in our minds with the worst excesses of the Stalin regime on the one hand, and a ubiquitous web of dastardly internal subversion on the other (it took us a while to find out that all those trials were second-rate frame-up jobs), the Establishment has, to a certain extent, been successful.

If the responsibility for our hesitancy in turning to Marxism belongs with any one group, it is not the present-day students but their elders who, with some few very honorable and courageous exceptions, sold out their Leftist heritage for a mess of bourgeois respectability, thus allowing it to become the almost undisputed property of those whose objectivity could be—and often was—questionable.

It would be naive or dishonest —or both—to maintain that any body of philosophy, ideology, or dogma is capable of removing the crucial problems which now confront a groping humanity: *theory* is not what solves problems, but the *application* of theory in a concerted, coherent fashion by flesh-and-blood human beings. The immense value of Marxism is that it indicates which questions, out of a seemingly endless list, are most fundamental, and what should be the order of priority in setting out to deal with them.

All things considered, if the students have not been uniformly successful, we have at least been unwilling to be daunted. Our only major mistake has been in thinking that, because we had morality on our side, we could change history without studying it. And maybe that one is due to be corrected soon.

Have you thought of a sub to MR or an MR Press book as a Christmas present?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

Altogether, it now looks as though we would publish at least ten titles in 1963, and that means that we have an unprecedented need for working capital. It is therefore most gratifying to be able to report that early returns from the recent MR Associates appeal are running slightly ahead of last year, which set a new record in terms of both numbers of members and dollar income. But we *need* even more and could make excellent use of *much more*. Please, if you haven't yet joined, do so at once, with as generous a contribution as you can possibly afford.

The *Library Journal*, authoritative publication in its field, says of *Burning Conscience* by Claude Eatherly and Günther Anders that "it should be purchased by any library, especially public, where the clientele may have an interest in the vitally important question of The Bomb." Armed with this, you ought to be able to convince your local librarian to order at least one copy of the book, and more for larger libraries.

We are glad to welcome Professor Morrison's column, The World of Science, back to the pages of MR after a considerable absence. If readers have suggestions about topics they would like him to write on, please send them in.

Mr. Kenzy Doe (c/o 11 Isale Agbede Str., Lagos, Nigeria, W.C.A.) would like to correspond with U.S. pen friends "of any age or sex" with a view to learning the differences between his country and ours.

A good Ceylonese friend of ours strongly recommends a booklet entitled *Whither India-China Relations?*, by Theja Gunawardhana, as an authoritative treatment of a problem that has puzzled many U.S. friends of both China and India. It is published by Swadeshi Publishers, Colombo, Ceylon, but unfortunately contains no indication of the price. Please write the publisher, *not* us.

The response to the special July-August issue ("Monopoly Capital" by Baran and Sweezy) has been excellent. Quite a few readers have sent in specific criticisms or suggestions which will be given careful consideration by the authors when they prepare these draft chapters for publication in book form. Many thanks to all who have taken time to write. Meanwhile, the comment which pleased us most came from Morrison Sharp of Racine, Wisconsin. After providing some information which will be incorporated in the book, Mr. Sharp wrote: "I might add that examples of almost every statement of your July-August issue of MONTHLY REVIEW can be cited right here in Racine (Johnson's Wax, Western Printing, Racine Hydraulics) concerning the nature of the modern corporation. Your accuracy chills my old fashioned private enterpriser's blood."

Cuba is again very much in the news. If you have friends who have been brainwashed by the press and radio accounts of what has happened in Cuba, it is important that you help straighten them out. You can do so by ordering our new Cuba Packet which can be presented to them in one package. For details see page 308.

Have You Joined MR Associates Yet?
If Not, Are You Going To?
If You Are, Why Not NOW?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONTHLY REVIEW *Associates*

invites you to renew your subscription to MR automatically, and at the same time:

- help support the magazine and extend its influence as one of the few remaining voices of progress
- attend, free of charge, all MR Associates lectures if you live in the New York area, or get 1/3 off the list price of any MR Press book if you live outside the New York area
- receive, without cost, all pamphlets published by MR

Whether your subscription expires with the next issue—or not for another year—makes no difference. Joining the Associates now adds a full year to your present subscription.

To
renew your subscription to MR
help MR grow

JOIN NOW

MONTHLY REVIEW ASSOCIATES
333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose ..... dollars. Please enroll me as an MR Associate.

Check category (annual) below.

☐	$ 10 - $14	Contributing Associate
☐	$ 15 - $49	Supporting Associate
☐	$ 50 - $99	Sustaining Associate
☐	$100 and over	Foundation Associate

Note: Your choice of any MR Press book will be sent FREE to anyone becoming a Supporting Associate or better ($15 or more).

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

Please make your check payable to Monthly Review Associates

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED